

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

Claims 37-45 are pending in the application. The Applicants have amended claims 37-42. Claims 43-45 have been added. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The Examiner stated that the limitation “the content provider” has no antecedent basis. Claim 39 has been amended to recite “a content provider”. Therefore, the withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

5.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owensby (US 6,647,257) in view of Calvert (US 6,526,275). The Applicants have amended the claims to better distinguish the claimed invention from Owensby and Calvert. The Examiner’s consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

In one respect, independent claims 37, 39, and 40 have been amended to recite that a subscription between the content provider and the B2B engine provides that the B2B engine will notify the content provider whenever the telecommunication system reports that the mobile telecommunications device has met a predefined condition defined by subscriber preferences. The B2B engine then receives from a network node in the telecommunication system, status information indicating that the mobile telecommunications device has partially met the predefined condition. The B2B engine also receives from the mobile telecommunication device, status information indicating that the mobile telecommunications device has partially met the predefined condition.

The B2B engine then combines the status information from the network node and from the mobile telecommunications device to determine whether the device has met the predefined condition. If so, the B2B engine notifies the content provider that the mobile telecommunications device has met the predefined condition. The B2B engine then receives content information from the content provider, and automatically forwards the content information to the mobile telecommunications device without the mobile telecommunications device placing a call or otherwise requesting the content information.

The intelligence to combine status information from the network node and the mobile telecommunication device is disclosed in the specification on page 39, line 8 through page 40, line 6. This feature is not taught or suggested by the combination of Owensby and Calvert. Therefore, the allowance of independent claims 37, 39, and 40 is respectfully requested.

Claims 38 and 41-45 depend from amended claims 37 and 40 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claims 37 and 40. Therefore, the allowance of claims 38 and 41-45 is respectfully requested.

The subject matter of new claims 43-45 is disclosed in the specification on page 43, line 2 through page 44, line 8.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 37-45.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Date: Oct. 16, 2006
Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com